

## REMARKS

Claims 1, 15, 39, 41, and 57 have been amended, and claims 9, 11-13, 22, and 24-26 have been canceled. No new matter is presented by these amendments.

### Claim Amendments

As noted in the Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary regarding the interview of October 14, 2010, the Examiner proposed incorporating the features of claim 9 and claims 11-13 into the independent claims to further the claims towards allowance. Notwithstanding Applicant's belief that the claims as previously presented were patentable, Applicant has amended the claims as proposed by the Examiner in an effort to expedite the instant application to issuance. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of former claims 9 and 11-13; independent claim 15 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 22 and 24-26; and independent claim 57 has been amended to recite analogous subject matter. Applicant notes that these amendments are being made for the purpose of expediting the issuance of the instant application. Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of equivalent or broader scope in a timely-filed continuation application.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 8, 10, 15, 18-21, 23, 39-42, 45, 47-48, and 55-56 under 35 USC Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rangachari et al.* ("Rangachari") (US Patent 6,470,227), in view of *Tadokoro et al.* ("Tadokoro") (US Patent 6,463,352), further in view of *Tenney et al.* ("Tenney") (US Patent 6,944,584), further in view of *Haverstock* (US 6,192,415), further in view of *Arackaparambil et al.* ("Arackaparambil") (US 7,069,101). As discussed in further detail below, the combined teachings of these references would not have rendered the subject matter of Applicant's independent claim 1 obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

In response to these rejections, Applicant maintains that claim 1 is patentable over the cited prior art for at least the reasons noted in the Applicant's previously filed Request for

Reconsideration dated August 10, 2010. Applicant continues to believe that (i) the *Tadokoro* reference does not disclose a tool object model providing a logical description which enables initiation of processing on a tool as claimed; (ii) there is insufficient motivation to combine the teachings of *Tadokoro* with those of *Rangachari*; (iii) *Tadokoro* does not disclose the Applicant's claimed feature of awaiting an event report from the tool; and (iv) the *Haverstock* reference does not teach the claimed object and function fields of the Applicant's claimed URL.

Additionally, as noted above, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claims 9 and 11-13. The cited prior art does not teach, either alone or in combination, the claimed invention as now recited in Applicant's claim 1. More specifically, the prior art does not teach a tool management method including the Applicant's claimed features of receiving a second request, wherein in response to the second request, an HTML page is generated, and the Applicant's claimed method for overriding the tool object method.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art teachings of *Rangachari*, *Tadokoro*, *Tenney*, *Haverstock*, and *Arackaparambil*. Claim 15 recites a data processing system analogous to the teachings of claim 1, and is therefore patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Likewise, Claims 4-6, 8, 10, 18-21, 23, 39-42, 45, and 47-48 are patentable over the prior art for at least the reason that each of these claims depends from claim 1 or 15.

Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejection of claims 49-54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Rangachari*, in view of *Tadokoro*, further in view of *Tenney*, further in view of *Haverstock*, further in view of *Arackaparambil*, and further in view of *Nilsen et al.* ("*Nilsen*") (US 6,081,665). Claims 49-54 each depend from claims 1 or 15. The deficiencies of the prior art with regard to claims 1 and 15 have been discussed above. Therefore claims 49-54 are patentable over the cited art for at least the foregoing reasons, and by virtue of their dependence from claims 1 or 15. Independent claim 57 recites subject matter analogous to that of claim 1, and is therefore believed to be patentable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If any questions remain, the undersigned can be contacted at (408) 749-6913. If any additional fees are missing or due, please charge to **Deposit Account No. 50-0805** (Order No. ASTGP123).

Respectfully submitted,  
MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP

/David F. Lee/

David F. Lee, Esq.  
Reg. No. 60,474

710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 200  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085  
Telephone: (408) 749-6900  
Facsimile: (408) 749-6901